

Minutes, Science Advisory Committee Meeting 1/10/02

Participants: Ellen Gray (NPS – NCR), Paul Kazyak (MD DNR), Jim Voigt (NPS – CATO), Sue Salmons (NPS – ROCR), Ray Chaput (NPS – NCR), Doug Samson (TNC/MD), Dianne Ingram (NPS – CHOH), Craig Snyder (USGS – Leetown), Allan O’Connel (USGS – Patuxent), Diane Pavek (NPS – NCR), Gopaul Noojibal (NPS – NACC), Pat Bradley (EPA – MAIA), Mikaila Milton (NPS – NCR), Jil Swearingen (NPS – NCR), Scott Bates (NPS – NCR), John Sinclair (NPS – NCR), Christopher Jones (NPS – WOTR), Dorothy Keough (DOD – Fort Belvoir), Christina Wright (NPS – NCR), Ann Brazinski (NPS – GWMP), Melissa Kangas (NPS – GWMP), Doug Curtis (NPS – NCR), Stephen Syphax (NPS – NACE), Brent Steury (NPS – NACE), Kent Schwarzkopf (NPS – APPA), Dale Nisbet (NPS – HAFE), Marcus Koenen (NPS – NCR), Scott Bell (NPS – CATO).

Introduction

Welcome and administrative details were discussed by Ellen Gray. Introductions were made by the group.

Ground Rules

Description of the facilitator's role was done by Lucia Bragan. Her ground rules included:

- One person speaks at a time.
- No side conversations
- Explain the reasons behind your statements or questions
- Focus on interests, not positions
- Help keep the discussion focused
- Be specific—use examples
- Listen respectfully

Lucia Bragan mentioned that Linda Wright is the best facilitator in the Park Service.

Goals

Ellen Gray stated the purpose of this meeting is:

long-term to develop monitoring plans for the resources in our region

today 1. to provide an update on the July scoping meeting, 2. to develop a draft list of important resources within NCR, 3. to identify working groups with which we will identify threats and vital signs for the important resources.

Hopes and fears for the meeting: Lucia Bragan

Now that the goals are laid out, participants shared their hopes and fears for this meeting.

HOPES

I come away with a clear vision of what we're doing
Learn more about our vital signs
Define and identify resources
Get a full understanding
Accomplish meeting goals
I can be of some help
I learn something new
Important resources will be shared among parks
Enhanced partnership opportunities TNC-NPS
Identify important systems
To keep big picture in mind
Stick to regional priorities
Good exchange of information
Establish good working relationship
Get through agenda in one piece
Productive participation
Learn about resources at other parks
Accomplish objectives
Get through this agenda quickly and successfully

FEARS

Bogged down on issues
Stuck in traffic
Not getting home on time
Screw up 5- minute talk
We'll get lost in the details
Complexities will bog us down
Meeting will get sidetracked
More work for me
Get bogged down
I'll miss the important end
This will be just another meeting

July Scoping Update

Marcus Koenen gave the group an update on the July scoping meeting. He said that NPS is looking to initiate scoping before the end of the fiscal year. He proposed that we conduct a facilitated 3-day workshop to be held at NCTC--the week of July 8th or July 15th. Other locations may still be considered. Jim Voigt asked, "What is the purpose of this meeting?" Marcus Koenen answered that we want to present the ideas developed by the SAC to a larger audience, to present a draft monitoring plan and get more input, to come out with a clearer idea of what our vital signs are. We will get into monitoring protocols in future SAC meetings.

Stephen Syphax thought that we'd have a public scoping session with more of the general public involved—closer to the parks. Marcus Koenen said that we're looking for expert advice here not general public comment. Marcus has a list of 100 people for the planning meeting in July already compiled. [Note: The attached Scoping Participants lists people we have identified to be invited to scoping. Marcus asked later in the meeting that if you know of others who should be invited, please let him know.]

Stephen Syphax has stakeholders who will not be able to make it to NCTC. He thought this would be an opportunity for commentary in the sense of a NEPA process. Doug Curtis said perhaps we could allow a slot on one day of the scoping meeting for public comment of the general nature Stephen Syphax is referring to.

Ellen Gray said that we haven't set the location in stone yet. Marcus Koenen said that the July meeting will be one large meeting with smaller working groups.

Diane Pavsek said it's important to explain that NCTC is a training center run by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Marcus Koenen would like to come up with dates so we can set up the meeting in July. He suggests the weeks of 8th or July 15th. Diane suggests the week of the 15th—no other preferences are mentioned.

Park Summaries

Resource Managers were asked to summarize each park's most important natural resources.

Catoctin Mountain Park, Jim Voigt

Jim Voigt said that lately he's come to realize that politically the most important resource is the presidential retreat. However, simply regarding the natural resources, he said that the mountain landscape, the big picture is CATO's most important resource. There are many threats that are impacting this vegetated mountain landscape—adelgid, deer, gypsy moth, etc. Also, stream systems (Big Hunting Creek and Owens Creek) are important as natural cold water clean habitat for brook trout. In addition, scenic overlooks are important. There are issues with air quality. Vistas are an important resource, yet much of what the visitors are looking at is outside the park. Scenic vistas are a part of the visitor experience. Jim Voigt said that CATO needs to get more involved with regional partnerships in such areas as air quality.

Small wetlands such as Owens Creek are an important resource and contain state listed rare, threatened and endangered species. Also, at Catoctin, cultural resources are sometimes integrated into the natural resources. For example, historic buildings go along with the historic landscape in a natural context.

Doug Sampson has a question, "have there been a lot of management projects in cooperation with the state park? Jim Voigt answered that there has been some collaboration with regards to water quality and hopefully will be more regarding exotic plant removal along the boundary. Other than that not a lot of big scale management collaboration has taken place.

C&O Canal National Historic Park, Dianne Ingram

Most important resources:

- 1) Important vegetation communities
The park has 23 vegetation communities with 86 rare plant sites, including shale barrens that support endemic species of butterflies.
The park owns the bottom of these shale areas. Other important vegetation communities are the limestone cliffs and forest as well as the terrace floodplain dealt with in the Potomac Gorge Site Conservation Plan. This plan contains part of GWMP as well. The Potomac Gorge contains 200 rare species.
- 2) The gorge itself. NPS is a partner in conservation with The Nature Conservancy. TNC owns half of Bear Island, and NPS worked with TNC to develop the Potomac Gorge Site conservation plan.
- 3) Rare species as a group. The park has 243 species that are rare, primarily plants.
- 4) Aquatic species. The park contains natural ephemeral ponds that are prime amphibian breeding sites and are used by salamanders and frogs. The park also contains turtles and freshwater mussels.
- 5) Geologic resources. C & O Canal has 11 caves and mines. This is good habitat for hibernating bats. The park also has karst landscape which contains springs and seeps which are the habitat for subterranean species of ground water invertebrates.
- 6) Water resources. Some of the threats to this resource are recreation and political rights of way
- 7) Riparian buffer.

George Washington Memorial Parkway, Ann Brazinski

GWMP consists of 760,000 acres along the river landscape of the Potomac. Because the park is so linear it has issues with space. At some places the park is barely wider than the road. The park runs along the Potomac River shoreline and Palisades. Located in such an urban area, the park has major visitation issues, including many just commuting to work via the parkway and using the park's three marinas.

The natural resources at GWMP represent what's left of surrounding vegetative communities.

- 1) Water resources. These include the Potomac river intakes. There are many perennial streams that enter park property before emptying into the Potomac.
- 2) Dyke marsh tidal wetland. This area is an open water cattail march—deciduous swamp forest. There is a group, the Friends of Dyke Marsh, which contributes to the knowledge of this ecosystem through the donation of volunteer hours and the occasional sponsored research projects. Dyke Marsh is rapidly eroding, and needs restoration and identification of appropriate recreation.

- 3) Theodore Roosevelt Island. This is a swamp forest habitat with spring ephemerals. It is highly impacted by exotics.
- 4) Turkey Run. This section is around 200 feet above Potomac River and consists of large rock outcroppings, 12 deep ravines, and upland forest habitat. It is part of Potomac Gorge.
- 5) Great Falls (part of the Potomac Gorge) NPS collaborated with TNC on a Site Conservation Plan. This area contains seeps and springs-- abundant wetland communities.

Harpers Ferry National Historic Park, Dale Nisbet

HAFE is located at the base of the Blue Ridge Mountains where two rivers meet, the Potomac and the Shenandoah. Important resources include Maryland and Loudon Heights shale barrens, Jefferson Rock, John Brown's cave, and cultural resources including agricultural fields, earthworks in the mountains, and the foundation of industry. The forest was cleared during the civil war, but has since returned with minimal impacts, though some diseases have affected the trees.

Harper's Ferry has 100 acres of wetlands, 412 native plants, 200 non-native plants, riparian habitat which contains 20 of 26 state listed plants in the park. The mammal, reptile and amphibian studies will give us a better understanding of the wildlife at the park. The park has partial ownership of several islands. HAFE would like to get the park boundaries expanded with an additional 1500 acres. The park also has scenic overviews that are impacted by air quality and four streams, two major ones.

Manassas National Battlefield Park, John Sinclair

The most important resource at Manassas is the historic landscape, including shrubland and grassland meadow habitat that is in short supply in the region. There are several federal and state listed plants in the park and 5 rare plants listed by the heritage program. Rare communities include oak hickory, eastern white pine, piedmont swamp forest, and the most threatened, upland depression swamp. Also, white tailed deer and beaver are threats to park resources. There are rare, threatened or endangered species of concern, as well as 37 exotic species.

Monocacy National Battlefield Park, John Sinclair

The important resources at Monocacy include the historic landscape, which consists of active farms and second generation forest. Rare plants make up some of the threatened resources at the park. MONO also has several important vegetative communities. These communities include eastern deciduous forest, open fields, wetlands. Deer are impairing these resources. They may be altering many of these habitats. Species of concern include those that are over abundant or rare, threatened.

National Capital Parks East, Stephen Syphax

National Capital Parks, East consists of 10,000 acres, including natural and recreational areas. This park complex includes highly landscaped parklets in downtown D.C. as well as rural parks such as Piscataway, and Oxon Run. Much parkland is actually a scenic easement, for example, that protecting the viewshed of Mt. Vernon. The park was intended to protect the grand approaches to the nation's capitol, parkways, and the eastern end of the Civil War defenses of D.C., creating radiating park corridors. There is pertinent legislation to protect the forest and natural scenery. Important resources of the NACE complex include Fort Circle Ridge, the remnant eastern deciduous forest, shell marl ravine forest, and seeps and tidal marches. There are 100 state listed plants in these wetland areas as well as amphibians and reptiles. Because the park is very spread out, it must deal with fragmentation issues such as exotic plants. Much of our goal is in preserving the integrity of what's left of the natural communities represented in the park.

Prince William Forest Park, Mikaila Milton

The important resources of Prince William Forest Park include the Piedmont forest and Quantico Creek watershed. Because the park includes two physiographic provinces (Piedmont and Coastal Plain) and lies in the transition zone between northern and southern climates, it exhibits a wide range of habitat and vegetative communities. It is now the only natural area in the National Park System that contains a significant expanse of Piedmont forest. The headwaters of South Fork Quantico Creek, 9 square miles, lie within Quantico Marine Corps Base, while 4 square miles of watershed are in private ownership. The remaining 17 square miles of the watershed lie within the park. Thus the park has the unique opportunity to preserve and protect a large portion of this ecosystem. In fact, the park is one of the few in the region that contains in its enabling legislation the mandate to protect water quality (of Quantico Creek).

The park contains several rare communities, including a seepage swamp and remote stands of eastern hemlock that contain old growth specimens as well as two rare plants and several rare animals. The park also protects open space, which is a valuable commodity in a rapidly urbanizing area.

National Capital Parks Central, Gopaul Noojibail

Resources include both cultural and natural. NACC is an urban forest of 10,000 trees. Cherry trees are a huge component of both natural and cultural resources. The tidal basin is a resource that is threatened by sedimentation problems. The locks have been inoperable, so the basin has been filling up. Another resource is the historic elms. Dutch elm disease is a problem. The park is trying different resistant cultivars. Other threats include pollution, high ozone levels, pathogens on trees, flooding (East Potomac park) visitor impacts, opposing cultural and natural resources, beaver and geese which are a threat to the cherry trees, nutrient loads to the water. Urban forest monitoring of the whole area is needed, tracking which trees are doing better in which areas.

Rock Creek Park, Sue Salmons

Rock Creek Park is part of the urban complex of parks in the D.C. area. The threats to ROCR resources include exotic plants, water pollution, and other threats related to being in an urban area. Also, deer are increasing, posing a threat to vegetation communities. Tree diseases and lost wildlife habitat because of encroachment are also problems. Although the park legislation was written to avoid commuter traffic, it is becoming one of the major threats to park resources. Like other urban parks, ROCR is a complex of many small park units in addition to larger units such as Glover Archibold, Battery Kimble, and Rock Creek. Important resources at the park include three major streams, vernal pools (which are disappearing), floodplain (important for absorbing water during floods), springs (contain endangered species), and rare plants. Fish are also an important resource. There is currently an ongoing project to remove barriers to anadromous fish migration.

Rock Creek was the 3rd park added to the national park system and is part of the cultural historic landscape of the D.C. area.

Wolf Trap Farm Park, Chris Jones

Wolf Trap's main resource is the Filene Center. The park also has several scenic easements, though it is surrounded by urban development. Threats to park resources include sound, exotics, clearcutting, and dumping. 60 % of park is developed and 40 % is southern hardwood forest. There are two streams in the park and a spring fed pond. The streams originate in urban areas in Fairfax County, and only short sections are actually within the park. Water quality is an issue. The park contains a riparian buffer for about 1 mile of stream. Also high water events are a major problem due to lots of impervious surfaces within the watersheds. There are no known threatened or endangered species in the park, though not much is known about the natural resources of WOTR, since there is not much staff time delegated to natural resources. Natural resource needs include more knowledge of what the resources are and how to protect them.

Antietam National Battlefield Park, Marcus Koenen

Important resources at Antietam include the landscape that represents the Civil War period, such as agricultural areas, orchards and historical trees. Other important resources include aquatic resources such as streams, seeps and riparian areas, beech tulip poplar, and karst landscapes. Species of concern have been determined through the heritage program and include plants, invertebrates, fish, and deer. Some are threatened and others pose a threat to natural resources. Bird species of concern have been identified through Partners in Flight.

Appalachian Trail, Kent Schwarzkopf

The Appalachian Trail is a unit of the national park system. It passes through 14 states and 6 NPS units including C&O Canal and Harpers Ferry. Within National Parks, the AT corridor consists of 500 feet on either side of the trail. Because the AT passes

through several Park Service regions, it reports directly to WASO. The natural heritage program has conducted some inventories in some states. Plant inventories have been conducted in Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia. Bats have not been inventoried in any of the three states, and mammals, birds, herps, and fish are lacking for Maryland and West Virginia. The AT would like to join any of our inventories that have not yet been completed, especially bats.

Important resources along the AT include rare threatened and endangered species and significant natural communities. Rare plant inventories have been conducted for over 12 years. The Appalachian Trail is 270,000 acres in area. It passes through National Forests in addition to the National Parks; 516 natural heritage sites are contained within the AT corridor and 250 rare and endangered species are found there. New Hampshire has the highest number of endangered species followed by Virginia. Important communities include grass and heath bogs in South Carolina and subalpine spruce forests in northern New England.

Some of the heritage areas have established monitoring programs. Herps haven't been dealt with yet, while birds are the most frequently monitored. Bird monitoring at the AT started before the national I & M program got started. Several management suggestions have come out of these monitoring programs, including recommendations for trail relocation. Rare species are being monitored along the trail at 140 sites by volunteers. The AT has a total staff of 7, but 140 volunteers work with staff to accomplish the monitoring. AT staff has created 250 rare plant information sheets for trail maintenance crews, to reduce the damage to rare and endangered species during maintenance operations. Some of the threats to park resources are exotics and recreational use. Viewsheds and visibility are important resources that are threatened by development in the area. The AT passes through 75 land owners, so partnerships are critical for resource protection.

Park Presentations – Discussion: Facilitated, Lucia Bragan

What struck you during these presentations?

- Jim Voigt said that water was a recurring theme.
- Dorothy Keough said that the presentations gave a good sense of the broad range of large range resource considerations. They gave good foundations of information.
- Paul Kazyak said that most of the water resource are affected by lands outside the parks.
- Ray Chaput said that common themes came out in the presentations, such as habitat, forest, etc.
- Ellen Gray mentioned that urbanization and development are common threats.
- Pat Bradley said that invasive species are common throughout the region. Doug Sampson mentioned deer.
- Craig Snyder said that fragmentation and corridors such as riparian corridors are a common theme, and that many threats posed to resources come from outside the parks.

- Jim Voigt said that overpopulation is a common threat.
- Stephen Syphax said that parks are sanctuaries for biodiversity in the NCR. There are remnant native forests, for example. It is important to hold on to those remnants in the threat of urbanization.
- Ann Brazinski said that there is an overlap of resources between parks. From a national perspective NCR can almost be looked at as one big park.
- Kent Schwarzkopf said that rare T & E species are listed in most of the park units. Resources are shared across parks.
- Jill Swearingen said that the parks' purposes are compromised by things out of their control, such as population growth and commuter traffic.
- Ann Brazinski said that specific parks such as battlefield parks and natural urban forest parks are very different from rurally located parks.
- Doug Sampson said that scale and landscape context are important.
- Dale Nisbet said that different parks have different priorities. For some water is a priority and for some t & e species is more a priority. The parks have many of the same resources, but have different priorities in management.
- Stephen Syphax said that linear parks have lots of boundaries. This restricts what managers can do. It makes protection tough. Approximately half the parks are linear and half are not.
- Pat Bradley said that from a Mid-Atlantic prospective the parks are a microcosm of what's going on in the region as a whole, yet the Park Service does own the parks, and some things are in our control.

Lucia Bragan asked the group to think about how to come up with regional priorities. We need to identify important resources from a regional perspective, and form working groups around each resource category. The working groups will be gathering data leading up to the July scoping meeting.

What are the most important resources from a regional perspective.

Dorothy Keough asked at what level do we define resources. If we don't use a finer definition of the systems, we may be missing things such as bats or herps. Do we get into the things that are missing or to we concentrate on system wide themes such as how does the hydrology work in a system? We will naturally pick resources that we know exist.

Dianne Ingram asked whether we are thinking about resources or threats. They are intertwined.

Stephen Syphax asked whether that will shake out in the scoping process.

Ellen Gray answered that we need to wrestle with this before the scoping meeting. We want to pick resource categories that are not too broad. We will form work groups centered around the important resources. Part of the job of the working groups is to talk about the threats.

Doug Sampson is confused. He asked why the word natural is not being used in front of the term resource. If agricultural fields are a resource in one place and a threat in another it's confusing. He hopes the focus of this process is on natural resources.

Ellen Gray answered that it is hard to separate those in some parks such as battlefield areas. How do you maintain the natural resources in that context?

Ann Brazinski answered that some times the threats for natural resources are in conflict with cultural resource protection.

Craig Snyder said that we're here to just talk about natural resources and come up with the priorities within the network.

Doug Curtis asked Ellen Gray, "Are we not focusing just on natural resources?" Ellen Gray answered yes. We have concern about our cultural resources but we need to come up with ways to monitor our natural resources to pick out which vital signs to monitor.

Craig Snyder asked whether there are nationally imposed constraints.

Ellen Gray said there are not with regard to monitoring. Marcus Koenen said that the inventory is composed just of vertebrates and vascular plants from the national level.

Ellen Gray said that the national leadership might explore ways of common data collection parameters for networks that are monitoring similar resources.

Stephen Syphax added that cutting down riparian forest to restore the historic scene can happen.

< **LUNCH** >

Goals of the Working Groups

Marcus Koenen will now give more information on what the working groups will be doing. He first put up a regional map with the parks for an overview. He had handouts of the information he e-mailed folks (Workgroup Duties attachment). He identified the products of the working groups.

The working groups will:

- 1) Identify key threats for the listed resources.
- 2) Draft a list of monitoring questions that need to be answered for each resource.
- 3) Draft a list of potential vital signs for each resource.
- 4) Identify standard protocols used to monitor the proposed vital signs.

Marcus Koenen said we will now identify what are the most important resources for the region. A working group will be set up to address each of these resources. He asked the group to think broadly about the major categories of resources.

As part of the e-mailed information, a spreadsheet was sent with resources grouped to help us think through the process. This is a summary of our interview with park managers. Also, the work groups will go into the vital signs at the next SAC. We will not discuss the vital signs or threats today.

Identifying the Most Important Resources

Lucia Bragan asked each person to write down the three most important resources on the note cards passed out.

Marcus Koenen said that the goal is to have a working group to address these resources. In some cases it may be good to combine resources such as species of concern and exotics, or a group may decide these do need to be addressed specifically.

Marcus Koenen said that we will come up with a group of 10 to 12 regionally important resources today. We must consider what's important to both to the park and the region.

Lucia Bragan said that we can write down more than three to begin with and then identify the top three. Everyone should do this individually, so the first person who speaks doesn't influence the others.

Lucia Bragan continued that after folks have come up with their top three regional resources people at each table will go round robin and list what each has written. Then each table should identify the top seven regionally important resources.

Lucia Bragan advised everyone to write one resource per sheet, write big, and use three to five words—take away the descriptors. The group should think broadly, but may have one resource that stands out.

Lucia Bragan gave the group 20 minutes to come up with 7 important resources per table.

The tables should answer this question:

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT NATURAL RESOURCES FROM A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE?

After this Lucia asked each table to give her The most important one. The following were given:

Natural aquatic resources—natural vs. man made

Terrestrial communities

Native forests

Water resources—seeps wetlands, springs and streams

R T&E species

Water resources

Lucia Bragan grouped the two water resources.

Then she asked for our wildest one.

Landscape/landuse

Plants

Contiguous native vegetation communities

Landscape context

Transition area

Geologic resources

Lucia Bragan grouped the landscape ones.

Contiguous native vegetation communities, terrestrial communities, and native forests were grouped together.

The transitional area idea was clarified by Stephen Syphax to mean successional communities.

Lucia Bragan asked the group to give her the next one they feel good about.

Air, water, terrestrial vegetative communities, rare species communities, water quality and quantity, and geological resources were listed.

Next Lucia Bragan asked for something that's not up on the wall yet.

Verts, inverts, biodiversity—wet and dry, species of importance, wildlife, geology, soil, and riparian buffer were listed.

The final groups, after much discussion, are as follows.

WATER RESOURCES Doug Curtis, Group Leader

Natural aquatic resources

Water resources (seeps, wetlands, springs, streams)

Water resources

Water quality, quantity

Water

Aquatic communities

Wetlands

Riparian buffer

Biodiversity wet/dry

LANDSCAPE Chris Wright, Group Leader

Landscape ecology (Pat Bradley explained that this is looking at resources at a different scale. It's a discipline for looking at landscapes at a coarse scale.)

landscape context

landscape/landuse/

TERRESTRIAL VEGETATION COMMUNITIES (not specific species) Brent Steury, Group Leader

Contiguous native vegetation communities
Terrestrial communities
Native forests
Terrestrial vegetative communities
Plants
Transitional area—successional communities
Riparian buffer
Species of importance
Biodiversity wet/dry

GEOLOGIC RESOURCES Dale Nisbet, Group Leader

Geologic resources
Soil

R T&E SPECIES Diane Pavsek, Group Leader

Rare species/ communities
R T & E species

SPECIES OF CONCERN

Species of concern such as exotics and deer
Species of importance
IT WAS DECIDED TO ELIMINATE THIS CATEGORY, SINCE DEER/EXOTICS AND THE LIKE ARE THREATS AND NOT A RESOURCE. Marcus Koenen said that we just need to focus on resources for now, and later we'll decide what to do to make sure that these resources stay intact.

AIR

No one volunteered for this group.

WILDLIFE Scott and Jill (vertebrates and invertebrates), Group Co-Leaders

Verts
Inverts
Biodiversity wet/dry
Species of importance

OTHER

Viewshed
Aesthetics
Smell
Sound
Light

Allen O'Connel said he's been through this process before, and we should err on the side of restrictive. Otherwise the working groups get too unwieldy.

Melissa Kangas said that species of importance can be species which are common but have mandated protection through the park's enabling legislation.

Sue Salmons said that they can be keystone species or rare species.

John Sinclair suggested taking out the landscapes group. He said that this is the overall heading for all groups.

Mikaila Milton said that she would not like to forget it, because the scale is so important to keep in mind.

John Sinclair said that Marcus Koenen should explain his other category. Perhaps the other category should be the landscape group. Marcus Koenen asked whether the other group should be the quality control for all working groups. Pat Bradley would like to see the landscape working group stay as an integrative group. Lucia Bragan asked the group to see that things are looked at in a holistic way—big picture—that there is some integration between the other working groups.

Stephen Syphax said that he would fear that there may be something specific that may get lost if landscape is the integrative working group.

It was decided that the OTHER group will be an oversight group, providing synthesis between all groups.

Marcus Koenen said that we would like the group to get into working groups now. He will set separate tables up for each working group to identify which groups need more expertise.

Diane Pavek said that she would like to join multiple groups if that is possible.

Ellen Gray said that Diane Pavek should go to one table and put in parenthesis which other groups she's interested in so we can adjust the groups as needed later.

Diane Pavek said that we could join one group and act as a consultant to other groups.

Marcus Koenen said we should choose a leader of each group to take notes, etc.

Summary

Ellen Gray summarized the meeting. She said that there will be a 3-day scoping workshop in July with NCR parks and AT. At the meeting today we pondered the most

important resources from a regional perspective. We assigned ourselves to working groups to identify threats and vital signs.

Lucia Bragan took another look at the hopes and fears the group had brought up at the beginning of the meeting.

Doug Sampson said his worst fear was realized—more work.

Chris Wright liked breaking out into small working groups.

Diane Pavek liked the sticky notes.

We all got out on time.

END OF MEETING